STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA IOWA CITY

Television Center

February 14, 1961

OK Research Comm.

William G. Harley
NAEB
Suite 1119
DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Bill:

Please excuse the delay in responding to your letter of February 1. I would be pleased to accept the chairmanship of this committee again, though I am somewhat chagrined by the fact that, in my opinion, we made no contribution to the NAEB last year. I hope that we can this year. This suggested committee is fine with me. Sherk is the only one whom I do not know.

By the way, have you had a chance yet to think over the suggestions (involving the research committee) which I sent to you? If so, do you have any reactions? In addition to, or instead of, these, are there other contributions which you are hoping for from the committee in 1961?

See you in Washington one of these days.

Cordially,

Sam

Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film

SLB:ks

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

NAEB

Suite 1119
DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

February 1, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker
Director
Division of Television, Radio, Film
Television Center
State University of Iowa
609 10th Avenue
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

I should like you to accept appointment as Chairman of the Research Committee of NAEB for the year 1961. This is an important responsibility and one that I hope that you can accept.

Enclosed is a list of suggested names of members of the committee. I should like to begin this year a plan to help insure fuller participation by the membership in committee activities by involving "new blood", while yet preserving continuity; namely, an arrangement whereby members would be appointed for stipulated terms of three, two and one year. After the first year, three members would go off and three new members come on annually. Chairmen would have one year appointments but be eligible for re-appointment.

May I have your reactions and suggestions as soon as possible so that I can complete the committee roster for announcement in the next Newsletter.

Cordially yours,

William G. Harley

WGH:mem

Enclosure

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

	TERM
Sam Becker, Chairman	
H. Dennis Sherk Penn State University	3 ?
Jack Ellery Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.	2 ?
Richard Evans University of Houston	2 ?
Wilbur Schramm Stanford University	3 ✓ ✓
Kenneth Harwood University of Southern California	1 - p61 as over (membership ✓
Glenn Starlin University of Oregon	3 - p76 ✓
Hideya Kumata Michigan State University	2 - p65 ✓
Dallas W. Smythe University of Illinois	1 ✓ ✓
Bruce Westley University of Wisconsin	1 ✓ ✓

✓ sent 12/2

3 awaiting addresses.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

	TERM
Sam Becker, Chairman Director Division of Television, Radio, Film Television Center State University of Iowa 609 10th Avenue Iowa City, Iowa	
H. Dennis Sherk Penn State University	3
Jack Ellery Wayne University, Detroit Michigan	2
Richard Evans University of Houston	2
Wilbur Schramm Stanford University	3
Kenneth Harwood University of Southern California	1
Glenn Starlin University of Oregon	3
Hideya Kumata Michigan State University	2
Dallas W. Smythe University of Illinois	1
Bruce Westley University of Wisconsin	1

RESEARCH

INDIVIDUAL	PREFERENCE
F. Craig Johnson Ohio University	1
H. Dennis Sherk * Penn State	2
Harold Nelson Penn State	1
Bart Griffith U. of Missouri	3
Walter Emery * Michigan State	2
Leah Spanier * New York, N. Y.	2
Melvin Smagorinsky Brockport, N. Y.	2
Reba Benschater Omaha, Nebraska	3
Sydney Head U. Of Miami	3
Alfred ~~Gi~~ Solomon Oceanside, N. Y.	3
L. W. McMaster New York City	3
Tom Bletcher Cleveland, Ohio	3
James Mead Royal Oak, Mich.	3
Ken Harwood Los Angeles, Cal.	x
Donald Schein Schnectady, N. Y.	2
Frank Colson Tallahassee	2
Glenn Starlin Univ. of Oregon	2
A. Knowles Toronto, Canada	1
Samuel Becker State Univ. Iowa	1
Robert Suchy Milwaukee	3
C. J. McIntyre U. of Illinois	2

RESEARCH RECOMMENDED	BY
Lawrence Myers	C. W. Stone
Al Kelman	J. M. Morris
Robert Hilliard	Wesley Wallace
Walter Emery	Leo Martin
Dr. Frank Iezzi	W. A. Gregory
Dr. Sidney Kraus	Elmer Sulzer

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

In Cooperation with The U. S. Office of Education

NAEB

A SURVEY OF THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION FOR TELEVISION SPECTRUM SPACE

1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.

SURVEY COORDINATOR

VERNON BRONSON

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. J. BRUMBAUGH
Director, Planning Commission
Board of Control of Florida

C. SCOTT FLETCHER
President
The Fund for Adult Education

L. D. HASKEW
Vice Chancellor
The University of Texas

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS
President
The Fund for the Republic

KENNETH E. OBERHOLTZER
Superintendent
Denver Public Schools

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS
Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

PAUL WOODRING
Editor
Saturday Review
Education Supplement

REGIONAL CONSULTANTS

WILLIAM L. BOWDEN
Associate Director
Southern Regional Education Board

R. EDWIN BROWNE
Director, Broadcasting Services
University of Kansas

RICHARD S. BURDICK
Director, Metropolitan Philadelphia
Educational Radio and TV Corp.

JOHN C. CRABBE
Manager
Central California ETV, Inc.

KEITH M. ENGAR
Director, Radio-Television Service
University of Utah

KEITH NIGHBERT
Manager, Station WENH-TV
University of New Hampshire

JOHN C. SCHWARZWALDER
Manager, Station KTCA-TV
St. Paul, Minnesota

RAY STANLEY
TV Project Director
University of Wisconsin

KENNETH D. WRIGHT
Director, Radio and Television
University of Tennessee

NOrth 7-6000
Vernon Bronson

February 15, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director
Division of Television, Radio, Film
Television Center,
State University of Iowa,
609 10th Avenue,
Iowa City, Iowa.

Dear Sam:

We will have the initial meeting of our Advisory Committee for the Survey on Monday, February 27. It will convene at 9:30 am in the NAEB suite at the Dupont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C. As Chairman of our Research Committee I would like to have you be present at this particular meeting and get a good briefing of what we are doing, and perhaps make some suggestions as to some further things we ought to do.

If you can make this meeting please advise me as soon as possible and I will make a reservation for you at the Dupont Plaza Hotel for the night of Sunday, February 26. Of course, NAEB will take care of your travel and expenses for this trip. I do hope you can manage to be with us. With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

Vernon Bronson
Survey Coordinator

VB:jph

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

In Cooperation with The U. S. Office of Education

A SURVEY OF THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION FOR TELEVISION SPECTRUM SPACE

1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.

SURVEY COORDINATOR

VERNON BRONSON

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. J. BRUMBAUGH
Director, Planning Commission
Board of Control of Florida

C. SCOTT FLETCHER
President
The Fund for Adult Education

L. D. HASKEW
Vice Chancellor
The University of Texas

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS
President
The Fund for the Republic

KENNETH E. OBERHOLTZER
Superintendent
Denver Public Schools

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS
Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

PAUL WOODRING
Editor
Saturday Review
Education Supplement

REGIONAL CONSULTANTS

WILLIAM L. BOWDEN
Associate Director
Southern Regional Education Board

R. EDWIN BROWNE
Director, Broadcasting Services
University of Kansas

RICHARD S. BURDICK
Director, Metropolitan Philadelphia
Educational Radio and TV Corp.

JOHN C. CRABBE
Manager
Central California ETV, Inc.

KEITH M. ENGAR
Director, Radio-Television Service
University of Utah

KEITH NIGHBERT
Manager, Station WENH-TV
University of New Hampshire

JOHN C. SCHWARZWALDER
Manager, Station KTCA-TV
St. Paul, Minnesota

RAY STANLEY
TV Project Director
University of Wisconsin

KENNETH D. WRIGHT
Director, Radio and Television
University of Tennessee

Ned - Research

NBOrt 7-6000
Vernon Bronson

February 7, 1961

Mr. Sam L. Becker
Television Center
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

This is an S.O.S. Help!

I have an NAEB assignment on which I need your cooperation and counsel. Will you help me to identify the current and potential centers of educational television activity in your state?

You are, no doubt, aware of the study currently being conducted by the NAEB of nation-wide educational needs for TV spectrum space. I have been designated as one of the Regional Consultants through whom the field work will be done. It is our problem to survey present and future plans of educational institutions and agencies with respect to television and the need for channel allocations. We have until approximately April 1st to complete this phase of the study.

The area for which I am responsible includes Iowa, Illinois, Indiana and Michigan, as well as Wisconsin. Within that area, obviously, my first task is to identify the key institutions (and people) which are concerned with current and future applications of television to the solution of education's problems. This is where I need your advice.

Which institutions, agencies or departments in your state are currently using TV to good advantage?

Which, to your knowledge, are making plans for expansion or incorporation of TV into their programs of instruction? (And by "plans", we mean hopes and dreams, as well as budgeted requests.)

In either category, to whom should I address an inquiry for information?

We want to know about universities, colleges, extension correspondence programs, and state or city school systems, as well as ETV stations. Although the survey is directed primarily to a consideration of the need for broadcast channels, we also want to locate places where closed circuit systems may be used for transmission of instructional materials.

Since this request is being addressed to several NAEB-ers in your state, I don't expect anyone to report exhaustively on individual activities (for your own operations, that'll come later.) At this stage, I merely want to know "who" is doing roughly "what", so that I can obtain a profile of present and future planning in your area.

With ease (and a speedy reply) in mind, I've enclosed a form which you may find to be useful. I'm sure you'll understand that I will appreciate the highest priority you can give this request.

Cordially yours,

Ray

Ray J. Stanley
WHA-TV, Radio Hall
Madison 6, Wisconsin

RJS:cp
Enclosures

NAEB NEWS

For release on receipt

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

119 Gregory Hall Urbana, Illinois Phone EMpire 7-6611, Ext. 3394

Research Comm

For more information contact:
Mr. Vernon Bronson
Rooms 1119-1121
Dupont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.
Phone: North 7-6000

HOW MUCH TV FOR EDUCATION?

Washington, D. C. February 15, 1961--Just what does education need in the way of television channels, now and in the future? This is the question the National Association of Educational Broadcasters hopes to answer in a project it has undertaken with the U. S. Office of Education. The contract under Title VII of the National Defense Education Act was signed this week.

The survey has the blessing of the Federal Communications Commission, which has announced as its No. 1 problem that of proper allocation of TV spectrum space. Without specific evidence as to how much space educational groups will need, the FCC has indicated that education might be seriously slighted in any redesign of the TV allocation system.

In announcing the contract, NAEB President William G. Harley said, "The FCC is under constant pressure for channel space in a spectrum already crowded, and pressure can be expected to increase. We are hopeful that this project will result in specific documentation of education's needs."

(more)

Piloted by Vernon Bronson, former director of radio and television education for Dade County (Fla.), the project will start with a nationwide survey of educators to try to find out what the TV space needs are. This phase is expected to be completed by May of this year.

The second phase will be an engineering study of allocations to meet the indicated needs. Jansky & Bailey, Inc., NAEB's engineering consultants and one of the nation's foremost firms specializing in communications engineering, will handle this phase--which will be completed by September.

The project has been endorsed by various educator's organizations, among them the National School Boards Association and the TV Committee of the North Central Association.

On the advisory committee for the survey are:

A. J. Brumbaugh, Director, Planning Commission Board of Control of Florida

C. Scott Fletcher, President, The Fund for Adult Education

L. D. Haskew, Vice Chancellor, The University of Texas

Robert M. Hutchins, President, The Fund for the Republic

Kenneth E. Oberholtzer, Superintendent, Denver Public Schools

Benjamin C. Willis, Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools

Paul Woodring, Editor, Saturday Review Education Supplement

Assisting Bronson will be these regional consultants:

William L. Bowden, Associate Director, Southern Regional Education Board

R. Edwin Browne, Director, Broadcasting Services, University of Kansas

Richard S. Burdick, Director, Metropolitan Philadelphia Educational Radio & TV Corp.

John C. Crabbe, Manager, Central California ETV, Inc.

Keith M. Engar, Director, Radio-TV Service, University of Utah

(more)

Keith Nighbert, Manager, Station WENH-TV, University of New Hampshire

John C. Schwarzwalder, Manager, Station KTCA-TV, St. Paul, Minnesota

Ray Stanley, TV Project Director, University of Wisconsin

Kenneth D. Wright, Director, Radio and Television, University of Tennessee

######

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Sam Becker, Chairman

	TERM
Prof. H. Dennis Sherk Penn State University	3
Prof. Jack Ellery, ~~Radio and Television,~~ ~~Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.~~ → Chairman, Dept. of English, Speech & Drama East Tennessee State College Johnson City, Tennessee	2
Prof. Richard Evans, Dept of Psychology University of Houston, Houston, Texas	2
Prof Wilbur Schramm, Director, Inst for Comm Research Stanford University Palo Alto, California	3
Prof Kenneth Harwood, Chairman, Dept of Telecommunications University of Southern California Los Angeles 7, Calif.	1
Prof Glenn Starlin, ~~Chairman, Dept of Speech~~ ~~University of Oregon~~ ~~Eugene, Oregon~~ → Director, Inter-Institutional TV Proj. Univ. of the State of New York State Education Dept. Albany 1, New York	3
Prof Hideya Kumata, Office of Comm. Arts Michigan State University East Lansing, Mich.	2
Prof Dallas W. Smythe, Inst for Comm Research University of Illinois Urbana, Ill.	1
Prof Bruce Westley, School of Journalism University of Wisconsin Madison, Wis.	1

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

In Cooperation with The U. S. Office of Education

NAEB

A SURVEY OF THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION FOR TELEVISION SPECTRUM SPACE

1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.

SURVEY COORDINATOR

VERNON BRONSON

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. J. BRUMBAUGH
Director, Planning Commission
Board of Control of Florida

C. SCOTT FLETCHER
President
The Fund for Adult Education

L. D. HASKEW
Vice Chancellor
The University of Texas

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS
President
The Fund for the Republic

KENNETH E. OBERHOLTZER
Superintendent
Denver Public Schools

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS
Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

PAUL WOODRING
Editor
Saturday Review
Education Supplement

REGIONAL CONSULTANTS

WILLIAM L. BOWDEN
Associate Director
Southern Regional Education Board

R. EDWIN BROWNE
Director, Broadcasting Services
University of Kansas

RICHARD S. BURDICK
Director, Metropolitan Philadelphia
Educational Radio and TV Corp.

JOHN C. CRABBE
Manager
Central California ETV, Inc.

KEITH M. ENGAR
Director, Radio-Television Service
University of Utah

KEITH NIGHBERT
Manager, Station WENH-TV
University of New Hampshire

JOHN C. SCHWARZWALDER
Manager, Station KTCA-TV
St. Paul, Minnesota

RAY STANLEY
TV Project Director
University of Wisconsin

KENNETH D. WRIGHT
Director, Radio and Television
University of Tennessee

3 March 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director
Division of Television, Radio, Film
Television Center,
State University of Iowa,
609 10th Avenue,
Iowa City, Iowa.

Dear Sam:

I was sorry that you could not be at the meeting of the Advisory Committee in Washington last Monday. However, following your suggestion Bruce Westley attended and was of considerable help to us.

I have asked him to make a report to you but I am also enclosing a Memorandum of the meeting which I thought you might like to see. Any comments or suggestions you have will be appreciated. I will get in touch with you later about the Purdue meeting. At the present time I think it may be held on 20 and 21st. In any event, if I can arrange things I will get in touch with you. Thanks a million. All good personal wishes.

Sincerely,

Vernon Bronson
Survey Coordinator

Enclosures
VB:jph

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

The Advisory Committee for the Survey of the Needs of Education for Television Spectrum Space.

The meeting was convened at the Dupont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m. on February 27, 1961.

Four major problems were presented for the consideration of the Committee:

a. The reluctance of school and college administrators to project needs into a 10-15 year period;

b. Methods of projection of needs by this survey;

c. Criteria for determination and projection of needs by educational administrators;

d. Method of reporting.

1.) It was suggested that the rather prevalent reluctance on the part of the school and college administrators to project needs into an extended period might be overcome by the presentation of more detailed information and helping them establish conditions of consideration for such projection. Many administrators are so concerned with day-to-day operations that it is difficult for them to adapt values of measurement outside of their normal considerations. To do so, they must be provided

with some background preparation and some criteria of projection. This might be accomplished in correspondence by successive mailing of information sheets and some detailed reference to case histories of successful operations; and it might be accomplished in interviews by the interviewer laying the foundation with detailed background information and providing the administrator with some standards of projection in successive interviews. It was agreed that lack of time and funds militated against extended use of those methods in the present effort, but it was also agreed that such methods should be used to whatever extent possible.

2.) It was agreed that the data of this survey should derive from 3 major sources:

a. Grass-roots opinions and projections of local college and school administrators;

b. Regional conferences with small, typical groups of administrators now using the medium;

c. Experienced and informed projection by staff consultants of survey.

The comprehensive written surveys and personal interviews at the grass-roots level will provide a body of collateral evidence for the final results. They will also provide a basis for comparing projections of opinion with experience.

The regional conferences with administrators experienced in using television establishes a base of informed projection, as well as a guide for evaluating grass-roots attitudes and understandings.

The expertese projection by the staff will be based upon the analysis of the results obtained from the first two sources, plus consideration of the actual use and developmental planning factually reported.

In order for the survey to follow these methods, it was recommended that the contract be extended to include more funds for travel for the Consultants and for the Coordinator; that funds be provided for at least 6 regional meetings with administrators who are using television; that time limits be extended for final reports.

3.) It was suggested that a list of criteria for determining and projecting needs be furnished the Regional Consultants who are conducting the interviews and contacts, and that this common criteria be used by the interviewers to assist the administrators in determining and evaluating potential use of television. It was emphasized that a common approach to

such evaluation is essential for the effective results of the survey. It was suggested that some of the determining factors should be:

a. subject-areas now being neglected because lack of teachers or facilities;

b. such areas which could be served if broadcast television were available;

c. expected increase in enrollment in next 10-15 years;

d. further teacher or facility deficiency due to increased enrollment and/or other factors. (teacher shortage, limitation of tax base, etc.)

e. possibility of using broadcast television in cooperative effort to overcome such deficiencies;

f. comparison of possibility of meeting local needs by broadcast television with the experiences of other localities;

g. relationship of local needs and facilities to state and national resources of broadcast television facilities and materials (state networks, state-assistance to localities, Federal assistance through state plans, etc.)

It was recommended that these criteria be expanded and clarified and furnished to the interviewers.

4.) It was agreed that the reports of the survey should be factual and in narrative form with provisions made for such graphic presentation as will illustrate and clarify the data. The report should be pointed toward the specific audiences which will make use of it. These will probably be:

a. The U.S. Office of Education;

b. The National Association of Educational Broadcasters and collateral agencies;

c. The general educational community.

If possible the data should be compiled so that it may be published in the manner the end results and use might dictate. If potential use of the report data warrants additional funds should be sought for expanded publication by N.A.E.B.

It was recommended that the report be prefaced with a statement of documented research results, as a general justification.

5.) It was recommended that the coordinator arrange an early meeting with Dr. Walter Stone at the U.S.O.E. to discuss the suggestions and recommendations of the Committee.

A SURVEY OF THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION FOR TELEVISION SPECTRUM SPACE

This is important to you, and to everyone in the field of education in the United States.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has called upon education to document the needs of education for television spectrum space. He has indicated that unless such evidence is available in the forthcoming allocation proceedings, education might be seriously slighted in the new assignments, and might be permanently deprived of its present reservations.

Approximately 10 years ago the educational community, in a joint effort, persuaded the FCC to set aside a portion of the established television spectrum for the general use of education.

At that time few among us could begin to envision the potential need of television frequencies for educational purposes. Our demands for spectrum reservations were based mainly upon optimism and experimental fervor; but no one really knew what our needs were, or would be, for television frequencies.

During these ten years the development of the use of television, in all its phases, for education has been impressive, and the obvious potential use and need has grown beyond anything dreamed of when the original allocations were made. In spite of this, we, as an educational community within the nation, still have much to learn about our real as well as our projected needs for television. We must know much more about how such needs could or should be met. Failure to acquire such knowledge would be, to say the least, dangerous to the full development of television for education.

The FCC has stated that the matter of television allocations is its number one problem, despite the fact that the Commission and Congressional Committees have been working on it for the past five years.

A redesign of the entire TV allocations system will be considered in the near future.

In the rearrangement of available spectrum space, there are three major considerations:

1. Adequate television broadcast service must be provided to the entire nation.
2. The inequity between VHF and UHF assignment must be rectified.
3. Reasonable provisions must be made for present and future needs of educational broadcasting.

In view of the well-organized and documented presentations which have been made on behalf of commercial broadcasting, industry, and the Armed Services, it is incumbent upon education to state clearly the present and future needs of education for space in the television spectrum. Such a statement must be authoritatively documented. We must examine our present situation and carefully project our future needs. We must know our needs, and be able to inform the government of those needs in valid terms while we still have the opportunity.

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters, in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education, has undertaken the task of documenting the needs of education for space in the television spectrum, and will make an engineering study to support channel allocation claims.

This is an enormous task. We need the help and cooperation of the entire educational community to conclude this effort successfully.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

February 23, 1961

Dear Sam:

The form-letter I hope you will understand and excuse. The rest of the enclosures are descriptive material and a questionnaire which I hope you will either respond to, or direct to the proper persons with regard particularly to Iowa University.

Time and funds prevent all the personal visits which, ideally, should be made. I wonder if there would be any possibility of arranging for several Iowa-area people to meet at some reasonably central point in the state? Is the IJCET scheduled for a meeting soon? Or would a visit with Mr. Dancer serve the same purpose?

Plans & needs — Any time during March except March 12 & 18th

Avoid Wed.

a note from RAY J. STANLEY

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

In Cooperation with The U. S. Office of Education

NAEB

A SURVEY OF THE NEEDS OF EDUCATION FOR TELEVISION SPECTRUM SPACE

1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.

SURVEY COORDINATOR

VERNON BRONSON

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. J. BRUMBAUGH
Director, Planning Commission
Board of Control of Florida

C. SCOTT FLETCHER
President
The Fund for Adult Education

L. D. HASKEW
Vice Chancellor
The University of Texas

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS
President
The Fund for the Republic

KENNETH E. OBERHOLTZER
Superintendent
Denver Public Schools

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS
Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

PAUL WOODRING
Editor
Saturday Review
Education Supplement

REGIONAL CONSULTANTS

WILLIAM L. BOWDEN
Associate Director
Southern Regional Education Board

R. EDWIN BROWNE
Director, Broadcasting Services
University of Kansas

RICHARD S. BURDICK
Director, Metropolitan Philadelphia
Educational Radio and TV Corp.

JOHN C. CRABBE
Manager
Central California ETV, Inc.

KEITH M. ENGAR
Director, Radio-Television Service
University of Utah

KEITH NIGHBERT
Manager, Station WENH-TV
University of New Hampshire

JOHN C. SCHWARZWALDER
Manager, Station KTCA-TV
St. Paul, Minnesota

RAY STANLEY
TV Project Director
University of Wisconsin

KENNETH D. WRIGHT
Director, Radio and Television
University of Tennessee

February 21, 1961

Mr. Sam Becker
Television Center
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters is currently engaged in a survey of considerable significance to educators throughout the United States. In cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education, the NAEB is surveying and documenting the ways in which television is being used and will be used in the future as an instrument of education. The project is described more fully in the enclosed NAEB statement.

The field work in the survey has been assigned to a group of Regional Consultants, including myself. My area is comprised of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa and Michigan as well as Wisconsin.

Ideally, I should like to visit each institution or organization which is active (or planning to be) in ETV. However, such an extensive schedule of visits will not be possible in the relatively few weeks in which the work must be completed.

Therefore, and with some reluctance, I've resorted to a questionnaire, a copy of which is enclosed. Your response to the questionnaire, describing your present and contemplated ETV activities, will help to make this a comprehensive, more meaningful survey.

I will also appreciate your guidance and counsel with respect to the possible advantage of a personal visit to your organization, school, or system.

We hope to complete this phase of the survey before April 1, so that the information may be used as a basis for the subsequent engineering survey.

Sincerely yours,

Ray

Prof. Ray J. Stanley
University of Wisconsin
Radio Hall
Madison 6, Wisconsin

RJS:sr
Enclosures

NAEB Yes.

March 27, 1961

Harold E. Hill
Administrative Vice President
NAEB
DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Harold:

In regard to your letter of March 22 on the 1961 convention program, I would have these suggestions:

1. Since the International Seminar on Educational Television will be just coming to a close when the NAEB meeting starts, I would assume that one could get some very good speakers from other countries who would not normally be available. We have heard plenty from England, and a fair amount from France. We know practically nothing about the developments in other countries. Since the seminar is insisting on persons with a good knowledge of English, this should be no problem. Why not devote one session to hearing from a few of these people? Some of the NAEB'ers will hear them at Purdue but not the majority. In addition, the Purdue meeting will not cover radio at all. We could discover any interesting developments in educational radio in some of these countries.

2. Wilbur Schramm could do a paper pulling together that series of six or so studies on TV which the Department of Education has commissioned under his general direction. I gather that the study Bronson is doing is one of these.

3. Paul Lazarsfeld is always good for a talk on the kinds of research needed in an area --- television and children, educational broadcasting, or whatever.

4. William McPhee at the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia

University did a study for NBC a few years ago on what has happened to the radio audience -- patterns of listenings, etc. There is some interesting material which has never been released. I would assume that enough time has passed so that he could do a paper on it without getting into trouble with NBC -- and the material is still quite pertinent.

5. The University of Indiana Press is bringing out a book on "The Great Debates" this coming January. Included will be a series of studies which were done on the effect of the debates on voters, etc. A very good program could be built from this. The one to contact would be the editor of the book, Dr. Sidney Kraus, Department of Radio and Television, University of Indiana. I am sure that he would be happy to pull together such a program.

6. Tom Coffin, Director of Research for NBC has been concerned for some time with new directions which media research -- broadcasting research, specifically -- ought to take. He is bright, well-trained, and has given this much thought. Should be able to do a good paper, bringing the audience up to date on the advances made in going beyond nose-counting and then pointing out additional needs.

That dies me out. If I have other ideas, I will ship them right on.

Good seeing you -- even briefly -- in Washington.

Best,

Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film

SLB:ks

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

NAEB

DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

22 March 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director
Division of Television, Radio, Film
Television Center
609 10th Avenue
Iowa City, Iowa.

Dear Sam:

We are setting up plans for the 1961 NAEB convention which will be held here in Washington.

Following the suggestion made by you and others we want to devote one general session to the presentation of top-notch papers on important subject, presented by men who are authorities in their fields and who will command the respect of the audience.

I would guess that we will want to have, say, four such papers presented, and we would like your ideas for specific subject matter to be covered and suggested persons to prepare and present such papers. I know that your basic interest might be in the research field, and we will undoubtedly want at least one paper from that area. However, you will probably be able to come up with other topics and authorities, too, and it is for that reason that I am writing to you.

The persons we get should very likely be outside our own ranks, don't you suppose? I am also asking Vernon Bronson, as chairman of our NAEB Professional Development Committee, for suggestions as to topics and speakers.

Since arrangements for such things take quite a bit of time, I would appreciate your writing me as soon as convenient. If there are some of the persons you have in mind whom you know well enough to contact for us, please so indicate so that we will have that information should we decide on one of those persons.

Thanks a lot, and it was good to see you, even briefly, when you were in our office last week.

Lazarsfeld — Research needed on effects of TV on children
Schramm — report on the children & TV study

Sincerely,

Harold E. Hill
Administrative Vice President

HEH:jph

May 22, 1961

Harold E. Hill
Administrative Vice President
National Association of Educational Broadcasters
DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Harold:

I have discussed the problems of being away from campus for three or four contiguous days during the summer session with my boss here and am afraid that I will not be able to make it. I am scheduled to teach classes five days a week and have already accepted commitments to lecture on other campuses twice during the eight-week summer session. The feeling here is that this would simply be too much, coming on top of these other absences. I feel badly about this because it sounds as though it will be an excellent meeting. Though I was not present at it, the Allerton House seminar report still seems to be one of the outstanding documents ever drafted by an educational broadcasting group.

If you want a representative of the research committee present, and I believe that one should be there, I would suggest Bruce Westley, who will be on the campus presumably since he is teaching at Wisconsin.

I appreciate the invitation. I look forward to hearing the results of the seminar.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film

SLB:ks

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

NAEB

DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

May 16, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director
Division of Television, Radio, Film
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

This summer the NAEB will conduct a seminar at Madison, Wisconsin, which has been rather aptly described by someone as "Allerton - 12 Years Later".

This seminar, which will bring together the NAEB Board of Directors and certain committee chairmen and members, will be devoted to a searching self-analysis. In general, those attending will examine carefully the role now being played by the NAEB in light of what it should be doing, what it is best equipped to do, what the future should hold, etc. This will be examined in the context of the entire educational broadcasting movement and the NAEB's place therein.

The above is a very sketchy resume of what the planning committee has in mind, and more detailed information will be sent to you within two or three weeks. However, it is important at this time to find out whether or not you will be able to attend.

The seminar will be held July 16 - 19. Participants will arrive Sunday afternoon, the 16th. Morning and afternoon sessions will be held on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday and the seminar will close about 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday the 19th As has been the case with past seminars, it is anticipated that most participants will want to stay over on Wednesday night and depart on Thursday morning.

There will be no formal evening sessions, thus giving participants time for informal sessions and discussions.

The NAEB will pay your living expenses (room and board) while you are at the seminar and rooms will be provided in University of Wisconsin housing, with meals being eaten in the dining room. In addition, the NAEB will reimburse you for transportation according to the following table:

Distance in miles from normal place of residence to Madison	Reimbursement
Less than 200 miles	$ 25.00
200-399 miles	50.00
400-599 miles	75.00
600-799 miles	100.00
800-999 miles	125.00
1000 miles and over	150.00

The above represents total travel allowance, including any meals, tips, taxis, etc. In other words, room and board, while at Madison, plus the flat sum indicated will be the total reimbursement payable.

It will probably be possible to arrange for you to have your wife (and family if desired) stay with you in the University housing (with you paying her share, of course), but I will have to check on it. Will you please indicate whether or not your wife will be accompanying you (so necessary arrangements can be made), and children, too?

Will you please let me know, not later than June 5 whether or not you can attend the seminar? We anticipate that all participants will arrive on Sunday the 16th and depart after 5:00 p.m. on the 19th. (The planning committee will remain on the 20th to map out the report of the seminar.)

I will try to work out the details re wives and children and advise you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Harold E. Hill
Administrative Vice President

HEH:klp

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

NAEB

DuPont Circle Office Building
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

August 25, 1961

Mr. Sam Becker
Dir. Div. of TV-Film-Radio
Television Center
State University of Iowa
609 10th Ave.
Iowa City, IOWA

Dear Sam:

Let me try out an idea on you and get your reactions as to its feasibility, propriety, and appropriatness.

As you know, the commercial industry has been under attack from both the public and its representative in Congress and the FCC. The latter body, under Mr. Minow's leadership, has repeatedly indicated that it has a responsibility and authority to concern itself with stations' programs. As earnest of its intention to do something about programming, it has indicated that it will be paying increasing attention to discrepancies between program promises and performance when it comes to license renewals.

The result of this crackdown on station programming is that the station manager at long last is convinced that the FCC means what it says and is going to get tough; hence stations are belatedly becoming very worried about how to beef up the educational content of their schedules. To capitalize on their concern, NAEB has just issued a flyer calling to their attention the splendid selection of high quality educational programs available from its tape library.

The FCC has also indicated that in considering renewals of licenses it will pay attention to how well a station has geared its programming to meet the needs and interests of the community it serves. They have also indicated that in satisfying this requirement a station is not going to be able to just "fly by the seat of its pants", be guided by questions the director asks at the bar of the local Elks club, or use any other quaint divining rods which have gotten them by in the past. In fact, this means audience surveys.

Wealthy stations in metropolitan areas have means and facilities for carrying out such surveys; stations which happen to be situated in communities where there are colleges and universities have help at hand. But many stations which do not enjoy such advantages, are not in a position to conduct studies of their audiences, particularly surveys that are not suspect.

It occurrs to me that NAEB, under the aegis of its research committee, might set up in its Washington headquarters a national audience survey office, which would undertake to conduct surveys for local stations to determine the special requirements and wants of their audiences. I can envision something like the following:

1. A full time national research director, with secretary, and office in Washington.

2. A group of regional research directors (who might or might not be the members of the present committee) who would organize and supervise arrangements for surveys within their particular geographical area.

3. Wherever possible NAEB members and/or people on college and university staffs would be engaged for a fee to conduct a survey for a station in their vicinity.

4. The surveys would be conducted by educators and would use students to do the interviewing, doorbell-pushing, or whatever.

5. Although this activity would be undertaken as a service designed to return funds to the Association, it would at the same time provide some productive research opportunities for research people throughout the country.

6. Any or all of this kind of research undertaken for commercial "clients", would be done with strict regard for principles of scientific research and scholarly integrity. In other words, whatever the results showed, these would be the ones reported.

7. I estimate this would take $30,000 to set up such an office for one year, for personnel, travel funds and incidental expenses.

I know there is enough interest in this kind of thing on the part of the commercial stations so that I would have no trouble in raising the $30,000 in

advance to get such a thing on the road; I am also confident that this kind of a service, under such an educational mantle would find many eager patrons. I have checked this idea with our legal counsel and he does not feel that it is inconsistent with our non-commercial status.

If we really believe what we say in our constitution that "our purpose is to promote the dissemination of knowledge, information, education to the end of the educational and cultural and practical benefits of broadcasting may be extended to all", then assisting in meeting the needs of the public through broadcasting, whether via commercial or noncommercial facilities, would seem to be an appropriate concern of the NAEB.

I am sure there are all kinds of problems and headaches inherent in launching such an activity, but I do think it is worth considering and I would like to have your reactions. If they are at all favorable, we can go ahead and firm up a more concrete proposal to bring to the attention of the entire Committee.

Cordially yours,

William G. Harley

WGH/m3

August 28, 1961

Mr. William G. Harley
NAEB
DuPont Circle Office Bldg.
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Harley:

This is to acknowledge your letter of August 25th to Dr. Becker. He is out of town but I do expect him back about the middle of September. Your letter will receive his prompt attention as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

(Mrs.) Mavis Wieneke
Secretary

File: NAEB Research Committee

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

29 September, 1961

Professor Samuel L. Becker
Division of Television, Radio, Film
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

It is always nice to hear from you. Thanks especially for the note on statistics. It doesn't sound like a thing I would do, but I'll look up the article and the calculations and see whether I should hang my head or argue. I appreciate very much your writing about it.

But let me hasten to respond to your note about the breakfast. Are you sure I'm on that committee? I have no record of anyone asking me to be, or of accepting. And whereas I would do most anything for NAEB or you, still on October 24 I am supposed to be speaking to the Unesco National Commission's Africa conference in Boston.

Can I be of any help at long distance? I don't know exactly what that committee does, but with a vigorous chairman it ought to have a vigorous program. Good luck!

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Wilbur Schramm
Director

By the way, I enjoyed your piece in the recent issue of Studies in Public Communication. I would only take issue with the somewhat loose use of statistics here and there. Specifically, the t-tests for levels of intelligence in Tables 3 and 5 are not justifiable because of the lack of a significant interaction (shown in Tables 4 and 6). Since you found no significant interaction, you are only justified in doing a t-test on main-effects of television (that is, collapsing across intelligence groups) which in this case is unnecessary since there was only TV or no-TV and so the direction of difference is known. With the number of cases that you had, you have a fairly precise test of interaction with your analysis of variance. Ignoring these results and testing, in effect for interaction again, with your series of t-tests is quite hard to justify. I can see why you wanted to do it, in the light of a significant interaction in Table 2. However, it misleads the reader on the level of proof which you have for your conclusion about the effect of intelligence level. It seems to me that your results from the t-tests in Table 1 and just visual examination of Tables 3 and 5 is suggestive that television may be more helpful to bright and dull children than to average children. I don't believe that you can say more than that however.

Research Com.

September 11, 1961

Mr. William G. Harley
NAEB
DuPont Circle Office Bldg.
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Bill:

Please excuse the delay in responding to your letter and the brevity of this response. I just returned to town to find your letter here -- along with a large pile of other business to attend to. I am trying to do all of this hastily because I will only be in town for two days before leaving for another week to teach at an ICA seminar in Michigan.

I believe that your idea is a fine one. It seems to me that this is something which the NAEB could do quite readily, if it got the right person in as director in Washington. It ought to be someone who has had survey experience, not merely any sort of research experience. A prime candidate is Harrison Summers at Ohio State who has been doing surveys for many years. He is due for retirement there before too long and might jump at the chance to do something of this sort. Forest Whan at Kansas State has also had a great deal of experience at this sort of thing. In the yearly statewide radio and television surveys which he ran for many years in Iowa and Kansas and elsewhere he used student interviewers and faculty supervisors in each area. The only problem with Forest is that he would come rather high salary-wise I would guess. However, you might get more takers since he has quite a reputation among commercial broadcasters. I would think that interview schedules and other procedures could be standardized so that the project would not be too dependent upon regional research directors, not all of whom would have had great experience at survey work.

I would guess that your budget is far too low, unless the $30,000 does not include the cost of any of the surveys. You will find that you will need to pay both your local supervisors and the student interviewers. Otherwise, it is almost impossible to get dependable work done. (Even when you pay students for this sort of thing, someone will need to keep after them very carefully. Again, this would be the kind of thing with which Whan has had much experience. He probably ought to be brought in as a consultant in setting it up whether he becomes the director or not.)

I would suggest that we bring this up for consideration of the entire research committee prior to the NAEB convention so that some firm decision could be made there. Let me know if this is all right with you. If so, I can send each one a copy of your proposal to see what the reaction is.

By the way, please have your secretary delete the "609 10th Avenue" in the address you have for me. It is incorrect.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film

SLB:mw

September 27, 1961

428

Prof. H. Dennis Sherk
Pennsylvania State University
College Park, Pennsylvania

Dear Dennis:

We would like to have an informal breakfast meeting of the NAEB Research Committee on Tuesday, October 24, at 8:00 a.m. I do not know what the dining facilities will be at the Marriott but assume that we will be able to find some sort of place in the hotel. There is something called the Fairfield Inn there, which I assume is in the hotel. We will meet there unless I leave a note in your box at the hotel on Monday night indicating otherwise.

If you have a moment, I would appreciate a card or note indicating whether you will be able to make it. I am sorry that there isn't time to take a poll to discover the best meeting time for the entire committee. However, since this is the first full day of the convention, I assume that most of you who are coming at all will be there on that day. (As a matter of fact, this will be the only day which I will be able to be at the convention.)

Hope to see you in Washington.

Best,

Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:mw

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON 6

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

NAEB Research Committee

September 28, 1961

Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
Division of Television, Radio, Film
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

I'm sorry I won't be able to make NAEB this time.

I'm especially sorry since I seem to have represented you and the committee on a couple of occasions. I think you've been informed of the outcome of the trip to Washington to "advise" on the need survey. This was the usual case of getting research advice after the fat is in the fire.

I enjoyed the work session here and took quite a lot of time from classes to take part. The outcome in this case is represented by the statement on research contained in our draft statement. Since this largely represented viewpoints expressed by me, I hope it meets with the committee's approval.

Regards to you and the rest. Sorry to be a poop-out.

Yours,

Bruce

BHW:bfm

Bruce H. Westley
Associate Professor

NAEB research committee

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA

September 28, 1961

Dear Sam,

Thanks for your letter, and best wishes for a successful meeting of the Research Committee in Washington. I'll be with you in spirit, but the body must back summer session budgets here. Please let me know results.

Cordially,

Ken

Fib: NAEB Research Committee

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CULLEN BOULEVARD
HOUSTON 4, TEXAS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

29 September 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker
Division of Television, Radio, Film
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam,

It appears unlikely that I will be at the NAEB Meeting since unless I am definitely on the program there is no particular reason that I would ordinarily attend. I believe Roy Barthold will be there, however, if there is anything that you might like to pass along to me resulting from the Research Committee's Meeting.

A lot of interesting findings are emerging from our current Title VII Project. I will be interested in your reactions to our final report.

As chairman of the APA-Division 2, ETV Committee, I am still negotiating with Seth Spaulding concerning our proposed big scale conference dealing with learning theory and the new communication media. At the moment, we will be watching the Michigan State University Conference this fall for any possible overlap with our proposed conference.

Have you considered the possibility of a Title VII Proposal channeled through the NAEB Research Committee concerning some problem such as the "Changing Image" of ETV nationally as a result of recent pronouncements such as those of Newton Minnow?

At any rate, Sam, keep in touch with me, and in the event that something unexpected happens that I have to be in Washington at the time of the NAEB Meetings, which is possible in terms of a proposal we're negotiating with NSF, I would be delighted to be at the Tuesday, October 24th, 8:00 A.M. Committee Meeting.

Cordially yours,

Dick

Richard I. Evans
Professor of Psychology

RIE:v
cc: Roy E. Barthold

INSTITUTE OF COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS + URBANA

NAEB Research committee

1203 West Illinois, Apt. 3
September 28, 1961

Professor Samuel L. Becker
State University of Iowa
Division of Television, Radio, Film
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

In response to your letter of September 27, concerning the meeting of the NAEB Research Committee, I will be in Greece when you meet. Sorry.

Cordially,

Dallas

Dallas W. Smythe
Research Professor of Communications

S/tb

STATE
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

Division of Television, Radio, Film

October 2, 1961

RECEIVED
NAEB HEADQUARTERS
OCT 4 1961
AM 7|8|9|10|11|12|1|2|3|4|5|6 PM

Mr. Harold Hill
National Association of
Educational Broadcasters
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Harold:

In response to your memo concerning committee reports, I feel that it would be foolish for us to present a report from the research committee for the past year since we have really made no contribution to the association.

At the last convention, Ken Harwood and I met with Bill Harley and discussed some ideas which we had. We reiterated these in a letter following the convention. These were ideas we felt might promote more and better research among the educational stations and other members. With the recent headquarters move and the general uncertainty about the future, Bill felt that we ought not move ahead with any of those at that time -- which I certainly understood.

We were represented at the recent Madison meeting and at the advisory committee meeting for the survey of spectrum needs. However, on the latter, just as with the McLuhan project, the committee was informed about the NAEB's involvement with the project after it was so far underway that there was little constructive help possible.

Anyway, the point of all of this, is that we have nothing to report.

Looking forward to seeing you in Washington.

Cordially,

Sam

Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film

SLB:mw

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON 6

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

October 26, 1961

Dear Sam:

Thanks for sending a copy of your talk at Purdue. I guess you know I am very much in agreement with the basic thesis, and I think you stated it well. Will it do any good? That's another question.

Yours,

Bruce

Bruce Westley

Prof. Samuel L. Becker
Divsion of TV, Radio, Film
State University of Iowa

October 2, 1961

Mr. Harold Hill
National Association of
Educational Broadcasters
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Harold:

In response to your memo concerning committee reports, I feel that it would be foolish for us to present a report from the research committee for the past year since we have really made no contribution to the association.

At the last convention, Ken Harwood and I met with Bill Harley and discussed some ideas which we had. We reiterated these in a letter following the convention. These were ideas we felt might promote more and better research among the educational stations and other members. With the recent headquarters move and the general uncertainty about the future, Bill felt that we ought not move ahead with any of those at that time -- which I certainly understood.

We were represented at the recent Madison meeting and at the advisory committee meeting for the survey of spectrum needs. However, on the latter, just as with the McLuhan project, the committee was informed about the NAEB's involvement with the project after it was so far underway that there was little constructive help possible.

Anyway, the point of all of this, is that we have nothing to report.

Looking forward to seeing you in Washington.

Cordially,

Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film

SLB:mw

Send suggestions make to Harley

NAEB HEADQUARTERS
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

TO: All NAEB Committee Chairmen

FROM: Harold E. Hill

RE: Committee Reports at Convention

DATE: September 25, 1961

As has been the custom in the past, all committee chairmen are invited to present reports of their committee activities during the business sessions of the convention.

While it is not essential that a report be presented by each and every chairmen, it would be nice to have such a report, however brief. If you, as chairman, are unable to attend the convention, perhaps you could designate another member on your committee to present a report, and so inform said committee member.

If you care to present a report, we would appreciate your holding it to not more than 10 minutes. We would appreciate, too, your preparing your report in written form so that we may have it for the complete record of the convention and for the official files of the Association. This written report might well be only a page or two, and you could then use this as a basis for expanded oral remarks.

If you would care to have your report duplicated for distribution at the convention, this would be fine, and I would estimate that about 200-250 copies should be run off. While it is hoped that chairmen desiring to distribute their reports can have them duplicated and bring them to the convention, we will try to duplicate for you any reports sent in by October 9. If you follow the latter procedure, perhaps you can prepare the report on ditto master and send it to us in that form so that all we have to do is run it off.

For all reports to be duplicated, may I suggest the format indicated below? Such uniformity will give a better appearance to the reports.

Committee reports will be started at the first business session which will be held Monday afternoon, October 23. Those not presented at the time will be presented at the final business session on Thursday morning, October 26.

Will you please let me know by October 4 the answers to the following:

1- Do you plan to present a report?
2- Approximately how long will it be?
3- Will it be duplicated by you for distribution?
4- Will you want us to duplicate it for distribution?

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

Report of the xxxxxxxxxxxx Committee

Presented at the NAEB 37th Annual Convention
October 23 - 26, 1961, Washington, D.C.

mlm
9/25/61

NAEB Res Comm.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

October 6

Dear Sam:

Got your note on NAEB. Won't be able to make it since I'm due in Detroit on that day. However, I see we're in Lafayette at the same time the day before. Will see you then to discuss committee problems.

Cordially,

Wilbur

NAEB Bus. Comm

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS
1346 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

October 12, 1961

Mr. Samuel L. Becker
Director, Division of
Television-Radio-Film
State University of Iowa
609 10th Avenue
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

I am in hopes that your Research Committee can meet in connection with the Convention and discuss the possibilities of an NAEB Audience Survey Service along the lines we discussed in our correspondence.

Most of the Committees are meeting Monday morning and I am sure there is still time for you to make arrangements for this.

I'm off this week for a quick trip to Holland to represent the NAEB in the dedication ceremonies of Radio Nederlands. Look forward to seeing you later this month.

Cordially,

William G. Harley

WGH/mmm

NAEB Research Com.

EAST

TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE

JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, SPEECH, DRAMA

October 5, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director
Division of TV, Radio, Film
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

As you can see, there have been some changes made. I left Wayne last month and am now trying to adjust myself to a new environment.

I should like to attend the meeting of the NAEB Research Committee on 24 October 1961, but I simply can't get away for a trip to Washington. You may be sure that I sincerely regret that I can not be with you.

E.T.S.C. is a delightful place. There are twenty-six people on the departmental staff, and all appear to be amiable as well as competent. We have a new building, excellent facilities and 5100 students. What more could I ask?

I am working on a Radio-TV development program and hope to make rapid progress. I'll keep you informed of our progress.

Ellen and I have just moved our crew into our new home. We built a Cape Cod house on a half acre of land just two miles from my office. It is a delightful place.

Do let me know what transpires at your meeting.

Cordially,

Jack

John B. Ellery
Chairman

JBE:lb

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY 1

OFFICE OF
THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

GLENN STARLIN
DIRECTOR, INTERINSTITUTIONAL
TELEVISION PROJECT

Starlin

November 9, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
Division of Television, Radio, Film
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

I am sorry that I didn't have a chance to see you except for a moment at the NAEB meeting in Washington. I never did know whether the NAEB Research Committee had a meeting and I am chagrin[ed] that I did not answer your letter of September 27 regarding this. It was delayed in getting to me since I was en route from Oregon for several weeks at that particular time. As I told you when we bumped into each other at the Marriott Hotel, I am now in New York State doing a study on the potential of television in higher education with the possibility of developing a state wide ETV network. If there are any developments in terms of other ETV stations in Iowa or plans for any sort of a state network, I would appreciate your sending me information of this nature on to me. ETV developments in other states will be of particular interest to powers that be here in the State of New York.

I trust that all is going well with you and yours at the University of Iowa. I regret I didn't have a chance to talk with you at greater length but perhaps I will get to see you at the Speech Association meeting in New York City right after Christmas. If I can be of any assistance, from a distance, as far as the NAEB Research Committee is concerned, please call upon me. Extend my best to Clay Harshbarger the next time you see him.

Kindest personal regards.

Cordially,

Glenn

GS:dc

Harwood

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA

November 21, 1961

Dear Sam,

Bill Harley's suggestion sounds very good. You or he should confer with Donald McGannon of the NAB Westinghouse Stations, who is chairman of the NAB committee on establishment of a research center, to determine any extent to which NAB has similar plans. We here are and have been studying audiences for commercial radio and television broadcasters of southern California and nearby areas. ~~Hope I could have joined you in Washington. Good wishes for the meeting.~~

Cordially,

Lyndon

EAST

TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE

JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, SPEECH, DRAMA

November 21, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director
Radio-TV Center
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

I am very sorry that we were unable to get together in Washington, but perhaps I shall have better luck next time. It would have been wonderful to visit with you and, who knows, we might even have solved a few of the world's problems.

Bill Harley's suggestion that the NAEB establish a national audience survey office has my enthusiastic endorsement. You may be sure that I would be happy to lend my services as consultant, supervisor, or what have you.

I have done some of this on a free-lance basis for commercial operators. My last fee was $500, which should give you some idea of the interest in such matters. Incidentally, I should prefer that you keep my fee confidential.

Let me know if there is anything that I can do to promote this plan.

Sincerely yours,

Jack

John B. Ellery
Chairman

JBE:lb

Hope to have a TV operation here before too long. Wish me luck!

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY 1

OFFICE OF
THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

GLENN STARLIN
DIRECTOR, INTERINSTITUTIONAL
TELEVISION PROJECT

November 22, 1961

Mr. Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
Television Center
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Dear Sam:

In answer to your letter of November 15, I think that Harley's idea for NAEB to set up a national audience survey office in Washington, D. C. is essentially a good one. The only question I guess I would have is why such an office should be limited to "conducting surveys for local stations to determine the special requirements and wants of their audiences". I am sure that this is a legitimate and often helpful kind of research activity but I would think that an organization which was set up with broader research aims and development might be better than one which was limited to audience research alone.

In terms of developing a possible NAEB research center, I think it might also be well to consider the stated interest in research which has recently come from NAB. President Collins of NAB, I believe, has set up a committee (with McGannon as chairman me thinks) which is presently discussing a NAB sponsored Research and Training Center. This committee is now engaged in some conference and discussion regarding the research needs and problems in broadcasting and whether such a center should be established at some university or in Washington, D. C. or some other metropolitan area. The Association for Professional Broadcasting Education has been quite interested and active in this NAB development. If NAEB is going to develop a research center, I think it might be well for Bill Harley to consult with and perhaps coordinate activity with Bruce Linton, President of APBE at the University of Kansas and/or with someone who is involved with the parent NAB Research Committee.

NAEB Res. Comm.

Mr. Samuel L. Becker November 22, 1961

It might also be noted that FCC Chairman Minow announced in his keynote address before the NAEB Convention that the FCC has set up a section devoted exclusively to education and research. I do not know exactly what he meant by research in this instance, but it might be well to consult with someone at FCC to determine exactly what their hope for development and research might be.

In other words, I think that some effort and coordination or consultation of all these research oriented and interested groups - NAEB, NAB, APBE and FCC - might prove profitable. At this moment I have no other suggestions to make regarding Harley's idea. I hope these have been somewhat helpful and, I would, of course, be interested in helping anyway possible to implement any research center which would bring more and better research studies in broadcasting.

Thanks for your note on the "development" of ETV in Iowa. I do not happen to have a copy of the state plan which you laid out some years ago, and would appreciate it if you could find an extra copy of it to send on to me.

Kindest presonal regards.

Cordially,

Glenn

Glenn Starlin

GS:dc

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

November 24, 1961

Mr. Samuel L. Becker
Chairman, NAEB Research Committee
14 Gregory Hall
Urbana, Illinois

Dear Sam:

I don't know that I fully understand this play which came by you out of Bill Harley, but if I do understand it I'm not very enthusiastic. Let me ask a few questions which will probably convey my feeling tone.

If this is to be purely a local operation -- i.e., NAEB puts an enquiring station into touch with a local survey research outfit -- what does the national research director do? (I am not implying that it wouldn't be a good idea for NAEB to sponsor research from a national outlook, but don't see exactly what a permanent, full-time research director in Washington would do in this case; nor, indeed, how they could make it exciting enough to get a really good man.)

Along the same line, what is this $30,000 for the national office to do? (Once again, I am all in favor of the national office getting more money, but how does this contribute to the project?)

Again, is this the best way to find out what audiences want and need? I am sure you will agree that people are pretty inarticulate about what new and different kinds of programs they want -- and even more about what they need. Would a better way be for the station to talk with representative leaders, perhaps to maintain a continuing program advisory council of such leaders? Frankly, I suspect that such surveys would be used as a delaying action by a station -- we have brought in this organization, sponsored by the NAEB, to survey our audience, and we are making maximum use of the results; in fact, if you will look at these responses, you will see that 87% of our audience had no concrete suggestions to make, and therefore were evidently completely satisfied, etc. Remember that this is research work to be done for the station; it isn't an outside evaluation of programs. The station would have complete right to use the results, and even to specify what is asked. I'm not really very hopeful that this would make a fundamental difference.

Again, I wonder whether this kind of applied, commercial research is what we ought to spend our time on? Certainly we at the Institute aren't going to spend our time on it. Supposedly, the results would be

the property of a station; there would be minimum opportunity for publication.

Now I am willing to be convinced that there is a place for an outside organization to come in and make an open study of a station's programs and a community's needs, and make the results publically known, but I am not yet convinced that this is the pattern of it.

Sincerely yours,

Wilbur Schramm
Director

WS:mc

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

NAEB

14 GREGORY HALL
URBANA, ILLINOIS

November 15, 1961

Professor Kenneth Harwood
Chairman, Dept. of Telecommunications
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

Dear Ken:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sm

Enclosure

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE • EAST LANSING

COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION ARTS

December 5, 1961

Dr. Samuel L. Becker
Chairman NAEB Research Committee
State University of Iowa

Dear Sam:

Let me respond briefly to Harley's proposal for the establishment of audience survey service. My first reaction is negative. I think the idea is a good one but does not require the setting up of a national office or the hiring of a full time national research director. Instead, let me suggest a consulting service with a roster of persons on call who could go to the localities concerned to help stations.

My objection to a full blown research operation takes the following:

a. The returns from such surveys (assuming that wealthy stations and stations near Universities need no help) will not support a full time operation.

b. The research opportunities which arise from such activity will be negligible since I fear that the setting up of the survey will be on a hurry-up basis and will not entail the kind of planning necessary to make the survey much more than a sheer nose-counting procedure.

c. College and university staff members are not going to fall over themselves to try and get one of these survey jobs. From experience, both of us know that simply because the cause is good does not mean any kind of research assistance particularly when the nature of the project is preset.

d. There are not enough persons interested in research who are also interested in broadcasting to make any kind of viable organization a realistic accomplishment.

e. No estimate of cost of surveys is included in the proposal. My feeling is that most stations are not willing to dish out the money to get any decent survey done. If a simple nose-counting procedure is all they need, why not underwrite a simple manual of how-to-do-it and sell this to stations?

These are my first feelings. I can be argued into another position if arguments are more cogent than those outlined in the Harley proposal.

Cordially,

H. KUMATA

November 15, 1961

Professor Dallas W. Smythe
Inst. for Comm. Research
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dear Dallas:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sjm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor Hideya Kumata
College of Comm. Arts
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Hide:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sjm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor Glenn Starlin
Director
Inter-Institutional TV Project
University of the State of New York
State Education Department
Albany 1, New York

Dear Glenn:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sjm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor Kenneth Harwood
Chairman, Dept. of Telecommunications
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

Dear Ken:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLBLsm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor Wilbur Schramm
Director,
Institute for Comm. Research
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

Dear Wilbur:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor Richard Evans
Dept. of Psychology
University of Houseton
Houston, Texas

Dear Dick:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor Jack Ellery
Chairman, Department of English,
Speech and Drama
East Tennessee State College
Johnson City, Tennessee

Dear Jack:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Professor H. Dennis Sherk
Penn State University
College Park, Pennsylvania

Dear Dennis:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implementation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:sm

Enclosure

November 15, 1961

Prof. Bruce Westley
School of Journalism
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dear Bruce:

Bill Harley has asked for the reactions of the Research Committee to an idea which he has had. Since we were unable to have a committee meeting in Washington with enough members present to obtain a meaningful committee reaction, I am trying to get a more complete reaction through the mails. A copy of the relevant sections of Bill's letter is enclosed. I would appreciate your candid reactions to the idea. If you believe it to be a good one, any suggestions which you have for implmentation, I am sure, would be appreciated both by Harley and by the next chairman of the research committee.

I hope that you will have an opportunity to respond in the not-too-distant future.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Becker
Chairman
NAEB Research Committee

SLB:mw

Enclosure

As you know, the commercial industry has been under attack from both the public and its representative in Congress and the FCC. The latter body, under Mr. Minow's leadership, has repeatedly indicated that it has a responsibility and authority to concern itself with stations' programs. As earnest of its intention to do something about programming, it has indicated that it will be paying increasing attention to discrepancies between program promises and performance when it comes to license renewals.

The result of this crackdown on station programming is that the station manager at long last is convinced that the FCC means what it says and is going to get tough; hence stations are belatedly becoming very worried about how to beef up the educational content of their schedules. To capitalize on their concern, NAEB has just issued a flyer calling to their attention the splendid selection of high quality educational programs available from its tape library.

The FCC has also indicated that in considering renewals of licenses it will pay attention to how well a station has geared its programming to meet the needs and interests of the community it serves. They have also indicated that in satisfying this requirement a station is not going to be able to just "fly by the seat of its pants", be guided by questions the director asks at the bar of the local Elks club, or use any other quaint divining rods which have gotten them by in the past. In fact, this means audience surveys.

Wealthy stations in metropolitan areas have means and facilities for carrying out such surveys; stations which happen to be situated in communities where there are colleges and universities have help at hand. But many stations which do not enjoy such advantages, are not in a position to conduct studies of their audiences, particularly surveys that are not suspect.

It occurs to me that NAEB, under the aegis of its research committee, might set up in its Washington headquarters a national audience survey office, which would undertake to conduct surveys for local stations to determine the special requirements and wants of their audiences. I can envision something like the following:

1. A full time national research director, with secretary, and office in Washington.

2. A group of regional research directors (who might or might not be the members of the present committee) who would organize and supervise arrangements for surveys within their particular geographical area.

3. Wherever possible NAEB members and/or people on college and university staffs would be engaged for a fee to conduct a survey for a station in their vicinity.

4. The surveys would be conducted by educators and would use students to do the interviewing, doorbell-pushing, or whatever.

5. Although this activity would be undertaken as a service designed to return funds to the Association, it would at the same time provide some productive research opportunities for research people throughout the country.

6. Any or all of this kind of research undertaken for commercial "clients", would be done with strict regard for principles of scientific research and scholarly integrity. In other words, whatever the results showed, these would be the ones reported.

7. I estimate this would take $30,000 to set up such an office for one year, for personnel, travel funds and incidental expenses.

I know there is enough interest in this kind of thing on the part of the commercial stations so that I would have no trouble in raising the $30,000 in advance to get such a thing on the road; I am also confident that this kind of a service, under such an educational mantle would find many eager patrons. I have checked this idea with our legal counsel and he does not feel that it is inconsistent with our non-commercial status.

If we really believe what we say in our constitution that "our purpose is to promote the dissemination of knowledge, information, education to the end of the educational and cultural and practical benefits of broadcasting may be extended to all", then assisting in meeting the needs of the public through broadcasting, whether via commercial or non-commercial facilities, would seem to be an appropriate concern of the NAEB.

NAEB Res Comm.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK • PENNSYLVANIA

College of Education
Department of Educational Services
Burrowes Building

October 13, 1961.

Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa.

Dear Mr. Becker:

According to present plans I should be in Washington for the convention, and will plan to meet with the Research Group for the breakfast meeting Tuesday at 8:00 a.m.

Very truly yours,

H. Dennis Sherk

H. Dennis Sherk
Dept. of Ed. Services

COPY

Sent for the information of

Dr. Samuel Becker

File

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS
14 GREGORY HALL
URBANA, ILLINOIS

Research Committee

June 13, 1960

Mr. Bob Brooks
Department of Radio & Television
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Dear Mr. Brooks:

I think your study would be very useful, and wish you luck with it. At the same time I feel I must say that the number of studies, requiring questionnaires, is so proliferating, and our station managers protest to us so much, and beg us to perform a "clearing house" -- that I fear we could not "sponsor" or "endorse" it. If we did, the score of others we've had to give this reply to wouldn't be very happy.

This doesn't prevent our liking your study; and we do wish you all success in it.

Sincerely,

Harry J. Skornia
President

HJS:jl

CC: Dr. Samuel Becker

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CULLEN BOULEVARD
HOUSTON 4, TEXAS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

7 December 1961

Dear Sam,

Sorry for the delay in responding to your letter of November 15, but I had to be out in Berkeley and Palo Alto and simply was unable to effectively keep up with any of my recent correspondence.

In principle, I believe that in Bill Harley's notion of an NAEB-sanctioned Audience Survey Research organization there appear to be several problems that such an organization would face. First of all, as I pointed out in my paper that appeared in the NAEB Journal on the Rating Services, even a group of educators involved in audience research might very well encounter the same problems in 1) the uncontrollable problem in operational aspects in conducting television surveys and 2) the possible biased uses of such results by stations, advertising agencies, or whoever is footing the bill. However, I would be happy to explore further the possibilities of Bill Harley's notion, since any attempt toward "clearing the air" in the television research audience area should be carefully considered.

By the way, our current Title VII Project is revealing some fascinating data. Our factor analysis particularly gave us some unusual insights. As I promised, I will send you a copy of the final report as soon as it is completed.

Keep in touch (hope we can get together one of these days soon).

Cordially yours,
Dick
Richard I. Evans
Professor of Psychology

Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
14 Gregory Hall
Urbana, Illinois

RIE:v

cc: Mr. Bill Harley

NAEB Res Comm

December 12, 1961

Mr. William G. Harley
President, NAEB
Dupont Circle Office Bldg.
1346 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Bill:

I'm sorry that I didn't get my answer to your query via Sam Becker off in time for inclusion in Sam's recent communication. Since the response is not unanimous, I think I'd better put in my two cents' worth even now.

On the whole, my position is most like that of Kumata. The points I'd like to underscore are these:

1) There are numerous private groups anxious to serve broadcasters interested in getting research data on their audiences. On the whole they can do the job more cheaply and uniformly than we could do it under the aegis of the national office.

2) Furthermore, they can meet the usual conditions more readily than we can--client control over content of survey, client control of publication, etc.

3) Many of us cannot meet these conditions at all. The University of Wisconsin does not permit the use of its name in connection with purely commercial research when contol of content and publication is not in the hands of the researcher. I'm sure we are not alone in this.

4) It would be all but impossible to guarantee a user uniform quality under the circumstances you describe. Such uniformity could probably not be enforced by the proposal office without making the proposal excessively unattractive.

5) Many of us are still interested in the dynamics of audiences in relation to content. But the usual commercial survey rarely adds to our mite of knowledge. And it is unfortunately true that routine audience surveys tend to justify the broadcaster in not taking risks, not trying something new, not worrying about grave local issues that nevertheless lack the drawing power of Lawrence Welk. Does NAEB want to associate itself with such a business?

As usual, I'm hopeful for any way NAEB can help us get significant research done on broadcasting. But this proposal as it stands does not appear to be the avenue we are seeking.

Sincerely,

Bruce H. Westley
Associate Professor

BHW:bfm
CC: Samuel L. Becker

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CULLEN BOULEVARD
HOUSTON 4, TEXAS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

11 December 1961

Dear Sam,

Upon returning to Houston and reading my letter to you of December 7, which was mailed in my absence, I notice that a word or two was left out of my second paragraph.

I had intended to convey the feeling that I do in principle agree with the idea of a NAEB-Sanctioned Audience Survey Research organization. There are, however, obvious problems that such an organization would have to solve to justify itself in the sense that it could do a job that is not only more ethical but is methodologically sounder than the existing commercial survey organizations.

I was much interested in the comments of the other members of the research committee. I think that in the case of Wilbur and Hideya, some real but, in my opinion, not insurmountable obstacles were articulated.

Cordially yours,

Dick

Richard I. Evans
Professor of Psychology

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
Department of Speech and Dramatic Art
Television-Radio-Film
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

RIE:v

cc: Mr. Bill Harley

7 December 1961

Dear Sam,

Sorry for the delay in responding to your letter of November 15, but I had to be out in Berkeley and Palo Alto and simply was unable to effectively keep up with any of my recent correspondence.

In principle, I believe that the Bill Harley's notion of an [redacted]-Educational Audience Survey Research organization there appear to be several problems that such an organization would face. First of all, as I pointed out in my paper that appeared in the NAEB Journal on the Rating Services, even a group of educators involved in audience research might very well encounter the same problems in 1) the uncontrollable problem in operational aspects in conducting television surveys and 2) the possible biased uses of such results by stations, advertising agencies, or whoever is footing the bill. However, I would be happy to explore further the possibilities of Bill Harley's notion, since any attempt toward "clearing the air" in the television research audience area should be carefully considered.

By the way, our current Title VII Project is revealing some fascinating data. Our factor analysis particularly gave us some unusual insights. As I promised, I will send you a copy of the final report as soon as it is completed.

Keep in touch (hope we can get together one of these days soon).

Cordially yours,

Richard I. Evans
Professor of Psychology

Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
14 Gregory Hall
Urbana, Illinois

RIEsv

cc: Dr. Bill Harley

Mr. William G. Harley
President, NAEB
Dupont Circle Office Bldg.
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Bill:

As I believe I told you in Washington, only one other member of the research committee, beside myself, showed up at the Research Committee meeting. Most of them, of course, were not at the convention. As a result, I polled them by mail on your proposal for the establishment of an audience survey service.

Rather than summarizing their responses, since most of them have a number of important points to make, I am submitting a copy of the relevant reaction from each individual. These men have obviously given some thought to the proposal and I believe that you and the next chairman of the research committee should have all of this information and thinking on which to base a decision.

Three of the members tended to favor such a proposal. Here are their comments:

Harwood: "Bill Harley's suggestion sounds very good. You or he should confer with Donald McGannon of the Westinghouse stations, who is chairman of the NAB Committee on establishment of a research center to determine any extent to which NAB has similar plans. We here are and have been studying audiences for commercial radio and television broadcasters of southern California and nearby areas."

Ellery: "Bill Harley's suggestion that the NAEB establish a national audience survey office has my enthusiastic endorsement. You may be sure that I would be happy to lend my services as consultant, supervisor, or what have you."

Starlin: "In answer to your letter of November 15, I think that Harley's idea for NAEB to set up a national audience survey office in Washington, D. C. is essentially a good one. The only question I guess I would have is why such an office should be limited to "conducting surveys for local stations to determine the special requirements and wants of their audiences". I am sure that this is a legitimate and often helpful kind of research activity but I would think that an organization which was set up with broader research aims and development might be better than one which was limited to audience research alone.

In terms of developing a possible NAEB research center, I think it might also be well to consider the stated interest in research which has recently come from NAB. President Collins of NAB, I believe, has set up a committee (with McGannon as chairman me thinks) which is presently discussing a NAB sponsored Research and Training Center. This committee is now engaged in some conference and discussion regarding the research needs and problems in broadcasting and whether such a center should be established at some university or in Washington, D. C. or some other metropolitan area. The Association for Professional Broadcasting Education has been quite interested and active in this NAB development. If NAEB is going to develop a research center, I think it might be well for Bill Harley to consult with

and perhaps coordinate activity with Bruce Linton, President of APBE at the University of Kansas and/or with someone who is involved with the parent NAB Research Committee.

It might also be noted that FCC Chairman Minow announced in his keynote address before the NAEB Convention that the FCC has set up a section devoted exclusively to education and research. I do not know exactly what he meant by research in this instance, but it might be well to consult with someone at FCC to determine exactly what their hope for development and research might be.

In other words, I think that some effort and coordination or consultation of all these research oriented and interested groups - NAEB, NAB, APBE and FCC - might prove profitable. At this moment I have no other suggestions to make regarding Harley's idea. I hope these have been somewhat helpful and, I would, of course, be interested in helping anyway possible to implement any research center which would bring more and better research studies in broadcasting."

The other two committee members had serious reservations. Here are their comments:

Schramm: "I don't know that I fully understand this plan which came by you out of Bill Harley, but if I do understand it I'm not very enthusiastic. Let me ask a few questions which will probably convey my feeling tone.

If this is to be purely a local operation -- i.e., NAEB puts an enquiring station into touch with a local survey research outfit -- what does the national research director do? (I am not implying that it wouldn't be a good idea for NAEB to sponsor research from a national outlook, but don't see exactly what a permanent, full-time research director in Washington would do in this case; nor, indeed, how they could make it exciting enough to get a really good man.)

Along the same line, what is this $30,000 for the national office to do? (Once again, I am all in favor of the national office getting more money, but how does this contribute to the project?)

Again, is this the best way to find out what audiences want and need? I am sure you will agree that people are pretty inarticulate about what new and different kinds of programs they want -- and even more about what they need. Would a better way be for the station to talk with representative leaders, perhaps to maintain a continuing program advisory council of such leaders? Frankly, I suspect that such surveys would be used as a delaying action by a station -- we have brought in this organization, sponsored by the NAEB, to survey our audience, and we are making maximum use of the results; in fact, if you will look at these responses, you will see that 87% of our audience had no concrete suggestions to make, and therefore were evidently completely satisfied, etc. Remember that this is research work to be done for the station; it isn't an outside evaluation of programs. The station would have complete right to use the results, and even to specify what is asked. I'm not really very hopeful that this would make a fundamental difference.

Again, I wonder whether this kind of applied, commercial research is what we ought to spend our time on? Certainly we at the Institute aren't going to spend our time on it. Supposedly, the results would be the property of a station; there would be minimum opportunity for publication.

Now I am willing to be convinced that there is a place for an outside organization to come in and make an open study of a station's programs and a community's needs, and make the results publically known, but I am not yet convinced that this is the pattern of it."

Kumata: "Let me respond briefly to Harley's proposal for the establishment of audience survey service. My first reaction is negative. I think the idea is a good one but does not require the setting up a national office or the hiring of a full time national research director. Instead, let me suggest a consulting service with a roster of persons on call who could go to the localities concerned to help stations.

My objection to a full blown research operation takes the following:

a. The returns from such surveys (assuming that wealthy stations and stations near Universities need no help) will not support a full time operation.

b. The research opportunities which arise from such activity will be negligible since I fear that the setting up of the survey will be on a hurry-up basis and will not entail the kind of planning necessary to make the survey much more than a sheer nose-counting procedure.

c. College and university staff members are not going to fall over themselves to try and get one of these survey jobs. From experience, both of us know that simply because the cause is good does not mean any kind of research assistance particularly when the nature of the project is preset.

d. There are not enough persons interested in research who are also interested in broadcasting to make any kind of viable organization a realistic accomplishment.

e. No estimate of cost of surveys is included in the proposal. My feeling is that most stations are not willing to dish out the money to get any decent survey done. If a simple nose-counting procedure is all they need, why not underwrite a simple manual of how-to-do-it and sell this to stations?"

You have my comments, which I sent to you when you first made the proposal. They are similar to those of Schramm and Kumata.

I am sorry that we were unable to meet, as a committee, in Washington in order to thrash out some of these points and to give you a concrete recommendation. However, as I indicated above, there are some ideas which these men have contributed in their reactions which I believe you and the next research committee should find helpful.

Cordially,

Sam

Samuel L. Becker

cc: NAEB Research
Committee members

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
MADISON 6

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

RECEIVED
NAEB HEADQUARTERS
DEC 14 1961
AM 7|8|9|10|11|12|1|2|3|4|5|6 PM

December 12, 1961

Mr. William G. Harley
President, NAEB
Dupont Circle Office Bldg.
1346 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Bill:

I'm sorry that I didn't get my answer to your query via Sam Becker off in time for inclusion in Sam's recent communication. Since the response is not unanimous, I think I'd better put in my two cents' worth even now.

On the whole, my position is most like that of Kumata. The points I'd like to underscore are these:

1) There are numerous private groups anxious to serve broadcasters interested in getting research data on their audiences. On the whole they can do the job more cheaply and uniformly than we could do it under the aegis of the national office.

2) Furthermore, they can meet the usual conditions more readily than we can--client control over content of survey, client control of publication, etc.

3) Many of us cannot meet these conditions at all. The University of Wisconsin does not permit the use of its name in connection with purely commercial research when contol of content and publication is not in the hands of the researcher. I'm sure we are not alone in this.

4) It would be all but impossible to guarantee a user uniform quality under the circumstances you describe. Such uniformity could probably not be enforced by the proposed office without making the proposal excessively unattractive.

5) Many of us are still interested in the dynamics of audiences in relation to content. But the usual commercial survey rarely adds to our mite of knowledge. And it is unfortunately true that routine audience surveys tend to justify the broadcaster in not taking risks, not trying something new, not worrying about grave local issues that nevertheless lack the drawing power of Lawrence Welk. Does NAEB want to associate itself with such a business?

As usual, I'm hopeful for any way NAEB can help us get significant research done on broadcasting. But this proposal as it stands does not appear to be the avenue we are seeking.

Sincerely,

Bruce

Bruce H. Westley
Associate Professor

BHW:bfm
CC: Samuel L. Becker

7 December 1961

Dear Sam,

Sorry for the delay in responding to your letter of November 15, but I had to be out in Berkeley and Palo Alto and simply was unable to effectively keep up with any of my recent correspondence.

In principle, I believe that in Bill Harley's notion of an NAEB-sanctioned Audience Survey Research organization there appear to be several problems that such an organization would face. First of all, as I pointed out in my paper that appeared in the NAEB Journal on the Rating Services, even a group of educators involved in audience research might very well encounter the same problems in 1) the uncontrollable problem in operational aspects in conducting television surveys and 2) the possible biased uses of such results by stations, advertising agencies, or whoever is footing the bill. However, I would be happy to explore further the possibilities of Bill Harley's notion, since any attempt toward "clearing the air" in the television research audience area should be carefully considered.

By the way, our current Title VII Project is revealing some fascinating data. Our factor analysis particularly gave us some unusual insights. As I promised, I will send you a copy of the final report as soon as it is completed.

Keep in touch (hope we can get together one of these days soon).

Cordially yours,

Richard I. Evans
Professor of Psychology

Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
14 Gregory Hall
Urbana, Illinois

RIE:v

cc: Mr. Bill Harley

11 December 1961

Dear Sam,

Upon returning to Houston and reading my letter to you of December 7, which was mailed in my absence, I notice that a word or two was left out of my second paragraph.

I had intended to convey the feeling that I do in principle agree with the idea of a NAEB-Sanctioned Audience Survey Research organization. There are, however, obvious problems that such an organization would have to solve to justify itself in the sense that it could do a job that is not only more ethical but is methodologically sounder than the existing commercial survey organizations.

I was much interested in the comments of the other members of the research committee. I think that in the case of Wilbur and Hideya, some real but, in my opinion, not insurmountable obstacles were articulated.

Cordially yours,

Richard I. Evans
Professor of Psychology

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Chairman
NAEB Research Committee
Department of Speech and Dramatic Art
Television-Radio-Film
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

RIE:v

cc: Mr. Bill Harley

RECEIVED
NAEB HEADQUARTERS
DEC 13 1961
AM 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 5 6 PM

Scanned from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Records
at the Wisconsin Historical Society as part of
"Unlocking the Airwaves: Revitalizing an Early Public and Educational Radio Collection."

A collaboration among the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities,
University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Communication Arts,
and Wisconsin Historical Society.

Supported by a Humanities Collections and Reference Resources grant from
the National Endowment for the Humanities

MITH MARYLAND INSTITUTE FOR TECHNOLOGY IN THE HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

WISCONSIN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE Humanities

Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication/collection do not necessarily reflect those of the National Endowment for the Humanities.